UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA WEST PALM BEACH DIVISION

United States of America

9:23-cr-80101-AMC

Donald J Trump, et al

V

APR 1 8 2024

ANGELA E. NOBLE

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THE DEFENDANTS

Jose A. Perez respectfully requests leave to file the attached proposed amicus curiae brief in support of the Defendant Donald J Trump's Motion to Dismiss the Indictment. District courts possess the inherent authority to appoint "friends of the court" to assist in their proceedings¹.

I

AMICI CURIAE AT COMMON LAW

At Common Law Amici Curie did not have to be an Attorney² and were permitted to bring to the Courts' attention points of Law and Fact³. The amici

³ Ibid 694

¹ Bayshore Ford Trucks Sales, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 471 F.3d 1233, FN 34 (11th Cir. 2006) citing Lathrop v. Unidentified, Wrecked & Abandoned Vessel, 817 F. Supp 953, 960 n. 10 (M.D.Fla.1993)

² The Amicus Curiae Brief. From Friendship to Advocacy, 72 YALE LJ. 694, 695 (1963)

curiae, were utilized at an early date to avert injustices which might otherwise have resulted from strict application of the principles of adversary proceedings⁴-

Wherefore, Mr. Perez respectfully submits that his right to proceed as

Amicus Curiae, ought to be subjected to a Bruen historical tradition analysis.⁵

II

WHENEVER THE GOVERNMENT INTERFERES WITH THE FREEDOM OF A PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IT IS SIMULTANEOUSLY INTERFERING WITH THE FREEDOM OF HIS ADHERENTS

Justice Hugo Black once explained⁶ that most cases before the Federal Courts involve matters that affect far more people than the immediate record Parties.

What was true of this Court in the past is true of most federal courts today. At every level, "lawsuits often are not merely a private fight and will have implications on those not named as parties⁷. The amicus curiae is not a party to litigation, but participates by making suggestions and ensuring complete presentation of fact and issues⁸.

⁴ Ibid 696 citing Coxe v. Phillips , 95 Eng. Rep. 152 (K.B. 1736).

⁵ New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n, Inc. v. Bruen, 597 U.S. _____, 142 S. Ct. 2111, 213 L. Ed. 2d 387 (2022).

⁶ Mary- Christine Sungaila, Effective Amicus Practice Before the United States Supreme Court: A Case Study, 8 S. Cal. Rev. L. & Women's Stud. 187, 188 (1999).

⁷ Wright & Miller, 7C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1901 (3d ed. 2002).

⁸ Alexander v. Hall, 64 F.R.D. 152, 155 (D.S.C. 1974).; The Amicus Curiae Brief. From Friendship to Advocacy, supra at 694,

Mr. Perez will show hereinbelow that the instant case involves and/or implicates HIS rights to vote and to election integrity: The US Supreme Court has ruled that qualified citizens⁹, like Mr. Perez, have a fundamental constitutional right to vote and to election integrity ¹⁰ and those rights are protected against federal encroachment by the First Amendment and state infringement by the Fourteenth Amendment¹¹.

Whenever, as here, the government arbitrarily, whimsically capriciously interferes with the freedom of a Presidential Candidate it is simultaneously interfering with the freedom of his adherents. ¹²

The Right of Suffrage in a free and unimpaired manner is preservative of other basic civil and political rights, any alleged infringement of the right of citizens to vote must be carefully and meticulously scrutinized ¹³.

The Eleventh Circuit has ruled that individuals have a right to a private cause of action to defend their right to vote and to election integrity¹⁴. The former

⁹ Voting rights act - §10101.

¹⁰ Purcell v. Gonzalez , 549 US 1, 4 (2006)

¹¹ Williams v Rhodes, 393 US 23, 30-31 (1974) Burdick v. Takushi, 504 US 428,

^{433, (1992);} Anderson v. Celebrezze, 460 US 780, 787-88 (1983)

Wymbs v Republican State Exec. Comm., 719 F. 2d 1072, 1084 (11th Cir-1984) citing
 Sweezy v New Hampshire, 354 US 234, 250-251 (1957); US v South Dakota, 636 F. 2d 241,
 245 (8th Cir-1980); Bullock v. Carter, 405 US 134, 143 (1972); Democratic Party of United
 States v. Wisconsin ex rel. LaFollette, 450 US 107, 122 (1981)

¹³ Smith, et al v Meese, et al, 821 F. 2d 1484, 1489-90, 1494 (11th Cir-1987) citing Reynolds v Sims, 377 us 533, 554 (1964): Griffin v Breckenridge, 403 US 88, 101-102 (1971)

¹⁴ Schwier v Cox, 340 F. 3d 1284, 1290 (11th Cir-2003)

Ш

CONCLUSION

For the reasons identified hereinabove, Jose A Perez, respectfully submits that the Court ought to grant his petition to proceed as Amicus Curiae..

Respectfully/Submitted,

Jose A Perez

21/28 William Street #273

Cape Girardeau, MO 63703

347-552-2881

theaesculapius@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Mr. Christopher Michael Kise 201 East Park Av. Ste 5th Floor Tallahassee, FL 32301 chris@ckise.net

Sasha Dadan

Dadan Law Firm, PLLC 201 S. 2nd St.Ste 202 Fort Pierce, FL 34950 772-579-0347 sasha@dadanlawfirm.com

Larry Donald Murrell, Jr.

400 Executive Center Drive Suite 201 West Palm Beach, FL 33401561-686-2700

Fax: 686-4567

ldmpa@bellsouth.net

Mr. James Pearce

U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

James.pearce@usdoj/gov

Jose A Perez

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Pursuant to S.D. Florida L.R. 88.9(a) Mr. Perez sent an email to the Parties'

counsel. At the time of editing, they had failed or refused to respond.

Jose A Perez

CLERK OF COURT 299 E BROWARD BLVD STE 108 FORT LAUDERDALE FL 33301

P:BLUE S:RIGHT | :14E 45-4960 1Z0E0858033580 5018 SAT08485 VLE 02-1 APY 18 06:48:38 2024 US 3331 HIPPS 24 3 1 SAT08485 VLE 02-15L